DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 564 CS 508 077

AUTHOR West, Terry L.; Pagano, Laura A.
TITLE Gender-Specific Language in Intercollegiate Debate: A Preliminary Investigation.
PUB DATE Oct 92
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (78th, Chicago, IL, October 29-November 1, 1992). Best available copy.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; *Debate; Discourse Analysis; Higher Education; *Language Attitudes; National Surveys; *Sexism in Language; Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Cross Examination Debate Association; Discourse Communities

ABSTRACT

A study examined the opinions of a substantial segment of the Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA) community about gender exclusive language. Questionnaires were distributed at two large but diverse CEDA debate tournaments. A total of 180 usable surveys were returned to the 390 distributed. Survey respondents (112 men, 66 women) included 134 undergraduate debaters, 27 coaches, and 19 hired judges. Results indicated that: (1) a majority of respondents recognized instances of gender exclusive language occurring in debate rounds often or frequently; (2) there was moderate agreement that debaters should avoid extemporaneous or prepared use of gender exclusive language; (3) large segments of the debate community believed that gender exclusive language was either an insignificant issue, or an acceptable practice; (4) a statistically significant difference was found between the views of men and women regarding gender exclusive language in CEDA; (5) there was greater concern over gender exclusive language among more experienced participants; and (6) a solid majority of respondents were opposed to any draconian or punitive measures in response to gender exclusive language. Findings suggest a large-scale lack of sensitivity toward gender exclusive language in academic debate. (Seventeen tables of data are included. Contains 15 references.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354564

Gender-Specific Language in Intercollegiate Debate: A Preliminary Investigation

by Terry L. West
and
Laura A. Pagano

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Terry L. West

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

[✓] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS 508077

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Gender-Specific Language in Intercollegiate Debate: A Preliminary Investigation

Terry L. West, Southern Illinois University
Laura A. Pagano, University of Michigan

Academic debate has an ancient tradition as an educational exercise designed to teach argumentation and prepare students for effective participation in a free society (Freeley, 1986, pp. 16-19). As such, debate must consider contemporary trends toward increased sensitivity to the escalating cultural diversity in academia and the world our students will enter. As any coach, judge, or debater who has flowed a "topicality" or "whole resolution" debate will surely attest, the study of language and how it is used is of great concern in intercollegiate debate. Another language issue often encountered in debate is that of gender exclusive language. In this paper, we will explore the subject of gender exclusive language in CEDA debate. Initially, we will make an argument from contemporary literature that gender exclusive language is undesirable, and that as speech communication professionals we are in a unique position to approach solutions to the problem. Second, we will present the results of a survey soliciting opinions of a substantial segment of the CEDA community toward gender exclusive language. Finally, we will discuss our conclusions based upon the selected literature and study results.

Gender Exclusivity in the English Language

Style guides such as the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (1983), and the guidelines of the National Council of Teachers of English (Nilsen, 1987, p. 37) are representative of the current trend toward avoidance of gender exclusive language patterns such as masculine generic pronouns. Contrary to the beliefs of some, use of "he" as a sex-indefinite pronoun is not a long historical tradition of the English language. Rather, it is a change less than two centuries old. Bodine (1975) writes, "prior to the nineteenth century singular 'they' was widely used in written, therefore presumably also in spoken, English. This usage met with no opposition" (pp. 131-133). Bodine also points out the use of sex-indefinite 'he or she' as a common alternative (p. 141). Thus, the effort to encourage the use of gender inclusive pronouns is not an attempt to change the English language to a new form. Instead, as Bodine argues, "intentionally or not, the movement against sex-indefinite 'he' is actually a counteraction to an attempt by prescriptive grammarians to alter the language" (pp. 130-131). These observations have two implications: (1) use of gender inclusive pronouns is not a radical change given its precedent in the English language, and (2) use of gender exclusive pronouns does not deserve the presumption of tradition since its heritage is actually shorter than that of gender inclusive pronouns.

The reasons that "he" came into use as the gender exclusive pronoun were hardly benevolent. There seems to be little doubt this exclusive language was created and its use encouraged for patriarchal motives and interests. Grammarians advocated the use of "he" as the sex-indefinite pronoun to champion the belief that men were superior to women (Bodine, p. 137). Bodine quotes one of the prescriptive grammarians to illustrate this point: "The Relative shall agree in gender with the Antecedent of the more worthy gender. . . . The Masculine gender is more worthy than the Feminine" (p. 134). Even the tradition of ordering male subjects before female subjects (boys and girls, King and Queen, he or she, etc.) was created to accord men a

ED 355077

higher status than that of women. Again, Bodine's source illuminates the point, stating "the worthier is preferred and set before. As a man is sette [sic] before a woman" (p. 134).

Bodine's analysis makes the argument that, independent of other content implications of gender exclusive language, the historical connotations are derogatory toward women. We argue that, as racial slurs are often unacceptable largely because of the strong association the words may have to the history of the humiliation and pain of slavery, gender exclusive language stands as a testament to its patriarchal roots and the subjugation of women by the society which spawned it.

There are numerous contemporary arguments against use of gender exclusive language. One obvious objection is that such language lacks acceptable precision. Bodine's research indicates that the "official" reason for changing to masculine generic referents was that use of "they" created a plurality disagreement with singular antecedents (p. 133). While this concern demonstrates an admirable commitment to precision, such a commitment would also call for equal regard to accuracy in the gender referent. Bryony (1988) makes a persuasive argument when she asks "what could be more imprecise than to refer to more than 2 1/2 billion people with the wrong pronoun?" (p. 335). Using "he" when people of both genders are referenced is no less precise than using "they" when there is a single subject: one is inaccurate with regard to gender, the other is inaccurate with regard to number.

The ambiguity need not be resolved by choosing the singular "they," however. For instance, the sentence "If a rider should fall, he should immediately remount his horse," need not be changed to a plurality disagreement—"If a rider should fall, <u>they</u> should remount." Instead, pluralizing both pronoun and antecedent is clear and accurate: "If riders fall, they should immediately remount their horses." Gender exclusive language is not only unclear and inaccurate, it is also unnecessary.

Gender exclusive language also promotes a quantitative bias. For example, "man" is a referent some defend as including both genders. Yet while men are always included by these terms, women often are not. On a structural level, "man" is frequently used in ways which include men but exclude women. For instance, if one speaks of "man's" creation of the atomic bomb, it is not difficult to envision male scientists gathered in a laboratory without females. Yet it is nearly impossible to create a position where the term "man" would suffice in a predominantly female situation. Brouwer and deHaan (1987) ask proponents of "man" as an inclusive term to attempt the sentence "early man breastfed babies longer than modern man" (p. 19). The sentence is clearly absurd; no men would be represented. Apparently males must naturally be included when "man" is used, while females need not be. It seems that there is a definite structural bias against equal inclusion of women when gender exclusive language is used.

As academic debate professionals within the field of speech communication, this imprecision alone is ample justification to examine the pedagogical needs which exist in our community regarding gender exclusive language. Sprague (1975) contends that the speech communication discipline is uniquely suited to focus upon issues of language, arguing that "avoidance of the question on the grounds that 'it's trivial to quibble over words' is so antithetical to the traditional stance of our discipline that it raises the suspicion that self-interest may be overriding scientific inquiry" (p. 41). Randall (1985) further supports this call to duty, noting our discipline's

particular concern about "clarity, objectivity, and precision," as justifying action against sexist language (p. 131-132).

Additional rationale supports examination of the impact of gender exclusive language in academic debate. Specifically, research indicates that gender exclusive language is harmful to women in particular and society in general. Martyna (1978) presents empirical evidence that use of masculine generic referents results in predominantly male images among college students (p. 137). Henley (1987) reviewed literature from numerous studies including Martyna's and found that gender exclusive usage detrimentally affects women's self-esteem and general beliefs about women's ability to perform certain jobs. Memory and comprehension, clearly significant to any pedagogy of learning, were also found to be adversely affected by the masculine generic form, and achievement levels of female students were directly enhanced by use of female-inclusive language (p. 7). The importance of these exclusionary effects is also felt in a larger societal context. Linguist Deborah Cameron (1985) contends that feminists must explore the role of language in supporting patriarchy so that they may overcome oppression (p. 3). She specifically analyzes the development of masculine generics, and concludes that they have prevailed because of their sexist nature, reinforcing and reinforced by the patriarchy (pp. 63-66). Randall (1985), after examining Bodine's article detailed earlier in this essay, concludes that "the use of masculine pronouns to refer to both sexes . . . is blatantly sexist, since it asks us to change widespread, long-lived spoken and written habits, to shift from a true generic [the singular "they"] to one that eliminates females" (p. 131). Given the above analysis it is hardly surprising that Blaubergs concludes, "sexist language by its existence reinforces and socializes sexist thinking and practices" (Gastil, 1990, p. 630).

Further evidence of the negative impact of gender exclusive language abounds. Gastil (1990) showed that "for both men and women he produces mostly male images with a few mixed images, scant female images, and few images of themselves" (p. 638). Gastil further relates what has become known as the "Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis"—our grammar shapes our thought (p. 630). Performing a statistical analysis of variance to analyze the effect of generic pronoun usage on perception, he concludes that the generic "he" indeed contains a male bias, and that the deterministic hypothesis is plausible (p. 639). We find more support for linguistic determinism from Richmond and Gorham (1988), who claim that while "linguists disagree on how, and how much, words affect perception, . . . most agree they do" (p. 142). The consensus in favor of the deterministic hypothesis is an important one. While gender-specific language may affect society by direct discrimination as described above, determinism has a more subtle effect upon each individual. The importance of this effect is developed by Sprague (1975), when she writes "much of the task of education is to encourage each student to develop a positive and viable self-concept" (p. 41). If linguistic determinism is true, and if the numerous examples of empirical research showing the sexism inherent in gender-specific language are to be believed, we are bound once again to incorporate the pedagogical justifications explained by Sprague and others in abolishing use of the masculine generic. Only then can we work toward a system of language which does not "determine" that men are important, and women are not.

Because of the importance of the gender exclusive language issue to academic debate as a part of the speech communication discipline, we decided to conduct a survey of reaction to the issue in the CEDA community. We believe this survey to be among the first systematic attempts to collect opinion data on the issue of gender-specific language in debate. As a result, we decided not to formulate specific research hypotheses; rather, we sought to discover emergent issues to stimulate future analysis. As general research areas, we were interested in the following questions:

1) Is gender-specific language perceived as a problem by the debate community?
2) Among those who perceive a problem, what are the proposed solutions?
3) Do the data reveal any interesting serendipitous phenomena, such as differences among groups, which might be of future interest?

Subjects

Three hundred-ninety questionnaires were distributed at two large but diverse tournaments debating the topic of the Cross-Examination Debate Association in February, 1991. One hundred-eighty usable surveys were returned. Surveys respondents included 134 undergraduate debaters, 27 coaches, and 19 hired judges.

Instrument

The questionnaire consisted of eight categorical questions soliciting responses to questions about awareness of gender-specific language issues in regard to intercollegiate debate. We deliberately used the term "gender-specific" as opposed to "sexist" to as much as possible avoid bias in the survey wording. We gave examples in an explanatory paragraph which included the use of masculine forms and pronouns for generic meanings. Ten Likert-scale questions then asked for opinions about whether gender-specific language should be avoided, and two final questions provided a checklist of possible corrective actions (including "none") for using such language, and an open-ended question to provide opportunity for further comment. Finally, demographic information was obtained, including gender, participant status, and years of experience.

Results

Question 1 asked: In your experience, how often does use of gender-specific language occur in intercollegiate debate. Responses are illustrated in Table 1:

Table 1—Occurrence of Gender-Specific Language in Debate

Response	Number	Percent
Never:	9	5%
Seldom:	43	24%
Often:	82	46%
Frequent:	43	24%
No Response:	5	1%
TOTAL:	180	100%

Questions 2 and 3 measured the perceived impact of occurrences of gender exclusive language. Question 2 asked: How many times do you recall gender-specific language being raised as an issue for discussion in an intercollegiate debate round? Question 3 was worded: How many times do you recall gender-specific language being used as a reason for action (i.e., criticism, reduction of speaker points, or decision) in an intercollegiate debate round? Results are summarized in Table 2:

Table 2—Impact of Occurrences of Gender Exclusive Language

Question	Never	1-3 Times	4-6 Times	More than 6	Total
2	82(46%)	51(28%)	23(13%)	23(13%)	179(99%)*
3	106(59%)	48(27%)	10(6%)	15(8%)	179(99%)*

*Totals are less that 100% due to missing responses

Questions 4-8 solicited "yes" or "no" responses to several questions designed to determine whether participants considered gender exclusive language to be a problem, and if so, whether the debate community was aware of the issue. The questions were worded as follows:

Question 4: Do you believe use of gender-specific language has historically been a significant problem in intercollegiate debate?
Question 5: Do you believe use of gender-specific language is currently a significant problem in intercollegiate debate?
Question 6: Do you believe intercollegiate debaters are generally aware of the issue of gender-specific language?
Question 7: Do you believe debate judges are generally aware of the issue of gender-specific language?
Question 8: Do you believe debate coaches are generally aware of the issue of gender-specific language?

Table 3 reflects the results from Questions 4-8:

Table 3—Summary Table of Questions 4-8

Question	Yes	No	Total
4—Historical Problem?	53 (30%)	123 (68%)	178 (98%)*
5—Current Problem?	53 (30%)	125 (69%)	178 (98%)
6—Debaters Aware?	66 (37%)	107 (59%)	173 (96%)
7—Judges Aware?	72 (40%)	102 (57%)	174 (97%)
8—Coaches Aware?	83 (46%)	87 (48%)	170 (94%)

*Totals are less than 100% due to missing responses and/or rounding.

Questions 9 through 18 were applied to a five-point Likert scale, with numerical values assigned to five categories—1) strongly agree (SA), 2) agree (A), 3) neither agree nor disagree (N), 4) disagree (D), 5) strongly disagree (SD). The results, abbreviating gender-specific language as GSL, followed by actual numbers of responses in each category and the overall mean average for the question, are as follows:

Table 4—Results of Likert Scale Questions

9. Debaters should avoid use of GSL when speaking extemporaneously.
SA: 50 A: 36 N: 40 D: 21 SD: 32 Mean: 2.7

10. Debaters should avoid use of GSL when preparing cases and blocks.
SA: 56 A: 43 N: 32 D: 19 SD: 30 Mean: 2.57

11. Debaters should ethically edit evidence to change or avoid GSL.
SA: 26 A: 14 N: 18 D: 28 SD: 94 Mean: 3.83

12. Debaters should avoid using evidence containing GSL.
SA: 16 A: 7 N: 36 D: 26 SD: 95 Mean: 3.98

13. Debaters should call attention to use of GSL by opponents in a debate.
SA: 12 A: 27 N: 43 D: 25 SD: 72 Mean: 3.63

14. Debaters should call attention to use of GSL by colleagues when preparing for a debate tournament.
SA: 38 A: 35 N: 29 D: 20 SD: 58 Mean: 3.13

15. Coaches should instruct their debaters to avoid use of GSL.
SA: 47 A: 32 N: 34 D: 16 SD: 51 Mean: 2.95

16. Use of GSL discriminates against women in intercollegiate debate.
SA: 33 A: 24 N: 25 D: 28 SD: 69 Mean: 3.40

17. Use of GSL limits success by women in intercollegiate debate.
SA: 18 A: 21 N: 31 D: 28 SD: 80 Mean: 3.69

18. National organizations such as CEDA should address the issue of GSL.
SA: 33 A: 23 N: 44 D: 20 SD: 59 Mean: 3.25

Item 19 asked: What should be the response of judges to use of gender-specific language in a debate round? Respondents were allowed to choose as many as they wished of several alternatives, including an option labeled "no action should be taken." The no-action option was listed first in order to avoid the suggestion of options to those who would normally be inclined to choose none. One hundred sixty-nine returned surveys contained responses to this question, with many choosing multiple options. Response numbers are displayed in Table 5:

Table 5—Desired Actions by Judges Regarding Gender Exclusive Language

Option	Number
No action should be taken:	88
Judges should take actions only as suggested by debaters raising the issue:	57
Judges should provide a written criticism on the ballot:	61
Judges should provide an oral criticism after the round:	68
Judges should lower the speaker points of the person using GSL:	25
Judges should reject arguments using GSL:	7
Judges should reject evidence using GSL:	4
Judges should vote against teams whose debaters use GSL:	5

Question 20 was an open-ended question, stating that respondents should "feel free to use the back of this form to indicate any other issues you believe are important regarding the issue of gender-specific language in intercollegiate debate, or any specific experiences you wish to share regarding the issue." Fifty-five respondents wrote in answer to this request. We performed a content analysis on the responses, with some participants writing comments that covered more than one category. The analysis revealed the following categories and numbers of responses:

Table 6—Content Analysis of Open-Ended Question

Response	Number
GSL is acceptable/traditional	11
GSL is not important/a waste of time	11
Debate should deal with other issues/GSL distracts	11
Critical of survey construction/intent	6
Alternatives to GSL are awkward	5
Sanctions toward GSL would be counterproductive	5
Editing evidence is unethical/undesirable	4
GSL is discriminatory/we should deal with the problem	5
We should teach to avoid GSL in a non-punitive way	5
CEDA should adopt some guidelines or suggestions	4
The issue should be debated within the round	3
The survey was a helpful tool/raised consciousness	3

In order to more accurately describe the samples we surveyed, we asked three demographic questions: gender, participant status (debater, coach, judge), and number of years spent in current participant status. Respondent gender divided into 112 men (62%), and 66 women (37%). Of the 180 respondents, 134 identified themselves as debaters, 27 as coaches, and 19 as judges. Ninety-five respondents claimed less than two years in their current capacity, 53 selected three to four years, 22 five to eight years, and ten more than eight years.

Data Analysis

The nearly two-thirds ratio of men to women represented in the survey suggests that further data analysis might be helpful in interpreting the results. Since the Likert scale questions (9-18) were intentionally designed without an attempt to measure exact intervals between the five potential responses, these figures were treated as nominal data. Thus, all data collected in the survey was nominal in nature. Post-hoc crosstabulations were conducted using the gender variable and the Chi-square statistic. Ary and Jacobs (1976) note that Chi-square is the proper statistical procedure to use when crosstabulations are performed upon data which fall into frequency categories, i. e., nominal data. Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1988) indicate that the Chi-square "is frequently used to compare two or more groups on a nominal variable with two or more categories. Considering "men" and "women" to be the two groups, we deemed this statistic appropriate for this analysis. The .05 significance level was chosen for this exploratory research.

Several crosstabulations demonstrated statistically significant differences in survey responses depending upon participant gender. Specifically, Table 7 illustrates gender differences in perceptions of frequency of occurrence of gender exclusive language:

Table 7—Crosstabulation of Respondent Gender by Question 1: How Often Does GSL Occur in Debate?

		Never	Seldom	Often	Frequently	
Gender	MALE	5	30	52	23	110 (63%)
	FEMALE	4	11	30	20	65 (27%)
		9	41	82	43	175*

Chi-square=10.12, D.f.=3, Significance= < .02
*Missing Values Result in N=175

The data indicate that women, on a percentage basis, are more likely to cite the occurrence of gender-specific language as occurring "frequently," while men are more likely to count the appearance of the issue as "seldom." In short, women seem to be more convinced that the issue occurs than do men.

Women were also more likely than men in the survey to cite gender exclusive language as both a historical and current problem, as demonstrated by crosstabulation in the following tables:

Table 8—Crosstabulation of Respondent Gender by Question 4: Do You Believe GSL is a Historically Significant Problem?

		YES	NO	
Respondent Gender	MALE	26	85	111 (62%)
	FEMALE	27	36	66 (37%)
		53	123	177*

Chi-square=10.62, D.f.=1, Significance= < .001
*Missing Values result in N=177

Table 9—Crosstabulation of Respondent Gender by Question 5: Do You Believe GSL is a Currently Significant Problem?

		YES	NO	
Respondent Gender	MALE	24	88	112 (63%)
	FEMALE	29	35	66 (37%)
		53	123	178*

Chi-square=15.37, D.f.=1, Significance= < .001
*Missing Values result in N=178

Statistically significant results, with the crosstabulation statistics appearing in Appendix A, were also obtained for several questions pertaining to desired actions in response to gender exclusive language. When analyzing the Likert-scale responses as nominal data, women were more likely than men to call for avoiding extemporaneous or prepared use of gender exclusive language and instruction by coaches to avoid such use. Women were also more likely to agree that such language discriminates against women and limits their success, and call for CEDA to address the issue.

Crosstabulation also revealed differences between groups when number of years in current participant status was considered. Table 10 reveals that the perception of gender exclusive language as a currently significant problem tended to increase in proportion to the amount of time participants had spent in their current capacity.

Table 10—Crosstabulation of Years of Experience by Question 5: Do You Believe GSL is a Currently Significant Problem in Intercollegiate Debate?

		YES	NO	
Respondent Experience	0-2 Years	22	72	94 (52%)
	3-4 Years	16	37	53 (29%)
	5-8 Years	10	11	21 (12%)
	9+ Years	5	5	10 (6%)
		53	125	178*

Chi-square= 9.97, D.f.=3, Significance= < .02
*Missing Values result in N=178

Although we found a tendency for the experience/perception trend to cross gender lines, statistics included in Appendix B indicate that statistical significance resulted primarily from the increased likelihood of women with longer tenure in the debate activity to cite gender exclusive language as a currently significant problem.

Discussion and Conclusions

We wish to begin our discussion with a straightforward position statement regarding what we believe to be obvious from our presentation of the selected literature. The unacceptability of gender exclusive language in education in general, and debate in particular, is a controversial issue only among the ignorant. Exclusion of either gender cannot be justified in an activity that is contingent upon fair treatment of participants. Gender exclusive language interferes with the essential goals of education. Further, exclusive language has a deleterious impact upon society in general. These reasons alone warrant concern and further investigation of appropriate actions.

Unfortunately, the survey results indicate that a large degree of ignorance does exist among our CEDA population. It is clear that a majority of respondents recognize instances of gender exclusive language occurring in debate rounds often or frequently. There is a tendency toward moderate agreement that debaters should avoid extemporaneous or prepared use of gender exclusive language. However, there also exist large segments of the debate

population who believe that gender exclusive language is either an insignificant issue, or an acceptable practice. Virtually half of the survey respondents signified that no action should be taken in regard to gender exclusive language in debate.

Data analysis reveals a statistically significant difference between the views of men and women regarding gender exclusive language in CEDA. There are several possible explanations for this phenomenon. It could be that men are oblivious to the significance of the problems of gender exclusive language, that they find such language acceptable, or that they believe the current system adequately addresses the issues. Perhaps women, as the most affected group, are extra sensitive to, or are more aware of, the significance of gender exclusive language. It is conceivable that there are larger gender issues in academic debate, and that different perceptions of gender exclusive language are but an indicator of those problems. Our selection of literature notes that gender exclusive language has often subtle effects upon the perceptions of students, their enjoyment of educational opportunities, and their societal happiness. Are these factors at work in academic debate? Is their any relationship between the gender differences found in this study and the concurrent finding that two-thirds of the participants were male? How can we explain some of the blatantly sexist positions toward gender exclusive language that appeared on some open-ended question responses? And, perhaps most importantly, what are the implications of the apparently huge degree of ignorance among the CEDA population surveyed here toward the harmful effects of gender exclusive language? It may be that the survey raises more questions than it gives answers, but the issues beg for further investigation.

Further questions arise upon consideration of the crosstabulations accounting for years of experience in the activity. We could interpret the tendency toward greater concern over gender exclusive language among more experienced participants as meaning that debate enhances awareness. Given the fact that most of that increased concern is apparent among women, we can plausibly assert that it is at least as likely that debaters (especially women) become more aware of the issue as a direct result of experiencing its occurrence in debates. Certainly, the numbers indicate that encounters with gender exclusive language are numerous. Given the rigidity of some respondents toward the idea of change, these encounters are likely to continue.

Finally, we can conclude that a solid majority of respondents are opposed to any draconian or punitive measures in response to gender exclusive language. We concur with this position, and suggest that non-punitive responses would be superior. If debate is an educational activity, coaches and judges should fulfill their roles in assuring that debaters of either gender are afforded an opportunity to participate without exclusion by language. We must teach debaters what the literature reveals about the impact of gender exclusive language upon individuals and society. We must encourage them to apply a heightened awareness of the need to avoid gender exclusion in debate rounds. Judges should feel free to address the issue through written or oral critique, and should consider whether stronger measures are warranted if deliberate abuse becomes evident. Debaters should cooperatively educate their colleagues toward the issues addressed in this paper. While we propose no "rule" adoption by CEDA, we would welcome a "sense of the organization" type of resolution from either the executive committee or the membership. This resolution would simply indicate that CEDA as an activity is committed to

enhancing full participatory rights for all persons regardless of gender, and that creation of an inclusive atmosphere is important to the attainment of that goal.

We believe that this survey points to a large-scale lack of sensitivity toward gender exclusive language in academic debate. Many debaters are seemingly unaware of the literature (or unwilling to accept its conclusions) pertaining to the objections toward gender exclusive language. We call for educators to work toward peaceful solutions to these problems, and believe that further investigation of gender issues in academic debate is justified.

References

Ary, D., and Jacobs, L. C. Introduction to Statistics: Purposes and Procedures. (1976). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Bodine, A. (1975). Androcentrism in Prescriptive Grammar: Singular "They," Sex-Indefinite "He," and "He or She." Language in Society, 4, 129-146.

Brouwer, D., & de Haan, D. Eds. (1987). Women's Language, Socialization, and Self-Image. Providence, RI: Foris Publications.

Bryony, S. (1988). Pronouns: Male, Female, and Undesignated. Et cetera, 45, 334-336.

Cameron, D. (1985). Feminism and Linguistic Theory. London: The MacMillan Press, Ltd.

Freeley, A. J. (1986). Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making. Sixth Edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Gastil, J. (1990). Generic Pronouns and Sexist Language: The Oxymoronic Character of Masculine Generics. Sex Roles, 23, 629-643.

Henley, N. M. (1987). This New Species That Seeks a New Language: On Sexism in Language and Language Change. In J. Penfield (Ed.), Women and Language in Transition (pp. 3-23). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., and Jurs, S. G. Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. 2nd Edition. 1988. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Martyna, W. (1978). What Does "He" Mean? Use of the Generic Masculine. Journal of Communication, 28, 131-138.

Nilsen, A. P. (1987). Guidelines Against Sexist Language: A Case History. In J. Penfield (Ed.), Women and Language in Transition (pp. 37-53). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. 3rd Edition. (1983). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Randall, P. R. (1985). Sexist Language and Speech Communication Texts: Another Case of Benign Neglect. Communication Education, 34, 128-134.

Richmond, V. P., & Gorham, J. (1988). Language Patterns and Gender Role Orientation Among Students in Grades 3-12. Communication Education, 37, 142—149.

Sprague, J. (1975). The Reduction of Sexism in Speech Communication Education. The Speech Teacher, 24, 37-45.

Appendix A

Table 11—Crosstabulation of Respondent Gender by Item 9: Debaters Should Avoid Extemporaneous Use of GSL in Debate

	SA	A	N	D	SD	
MALE	25	23	27	14	23	
FEMALE	25	13	13	5	9	
	50	36	40	19	32	(177)

Chi-square=23.00, D.f.=4, Significance= < .001
*Missing Values Result in N=177

Table 12—Crosstabulation of Respondent Gender by Item 10: Debaters Should Avoid Use of GSL When Preparing Cases and Blocks

	SA	A	N	D	SD	
MALE	29	31	20	14	18	
FEMALE	27	12	11	4	12	
	56	43	32	19	30	(180)

Chi-square=11.96, D.f.=4, Significance= < .05

Table 13—Crosstabulation of Respondent Gender by Item 15: Coaches Should Instruct Their Debaters to Avoid Use of GSL

	SA	A	N	D	SD	
MALE	24	21	24	8	35	
FEMALE	23	11	10	6	16	
	47	32	34	14	51	(178)

Chi-square=25.46, D.f.=4, Significance= < .001
*Missing Values Result in N=178

Table 14—Crosstabulation of Respondent Gender by Item 16: Use of GSL Discriminates Against Women in Intercollegiate Debate

	SA	A	N	D	SD	
MALE	14	14	15	22	47	
FEMALE	19	10	9	5	22	
	33	24	24	27	69	(177)

Chi-square=17.51, D.f.=4, Significance= < .01
*Missing Values Result in N=177

Table 15—Crosstabulation of Respondent Gender by Item 17: Use of GSL Limits Success by Women in Intercollegiate Debate

	SA	A	N	D	SD	
MALE	6	8	21	16	59	
FEMALE	12	13	9	11	21	
	18	21	30	27	80	(176)

Chi-square=22.64, D.f.=4, Significance= < .001
*Missing Values Result in N=176

Table 16—Crosstabulation of Respondent Gender by Item 18: National Organizations Such as CEDA Should Address the Issue of GSL

	SA	A	N	D	SD	
MALE	13	13	32	15	38	
FEMALE	20	10	12	3	21	
	33	23	44	18	59	(177)

Chi-square=29.92, D.f.=4, Significance= < .001
*Missing Values Result in N=177

APPENDIX B

Table 17—Crosstabulation of Years of Experience by Question 5: "Do You Believe GSL is a Currently Significant Problem?" (Women Debaters Only)

Question 5: Do you believe use of GSL is currently a significant problem in intercollegiate debate?

		YES	NO	
Respondent Experience	0–2 Years	6	19	25 (53%)
	3–4 Years	15	7	22 (47%)
		21	26	47

Chi-square= 10.13, D.f.=1, Significance= < .01
*Missing Values result in N=178